

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/603,438	SHAYLOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	J. Derek Rutten	2192	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowable

(1) J. Derek Rutten.

(3) _____

(2) Shun Yao, Reg. No. 59,242.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 January 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
101, 112 1st

Claims discussed:
1, 8, 15

Prior art documents discussed:
n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Rutten contacted Mr. Yao regarding newly discovered issues regarding 101 and 112 1st paragraph. In particular, claim 8 had issues regarding 101. Claim 8 is directed to an "apparatus" but contained only software elements. The examiner suggested amending claim 8 to include hardware elements to support the "apparatus." Additionally, all independent claims contained a lack of enablement under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph regarding "bytecode that may trigger garbage collection." Support for this limitation was found in provisional application 60/412,607. The examiner suggested amending the specification with the enabling subject matter on pages 92-93 of the provisional application. Since the amended subject matter was found in the provisional application, it is not regarded as new matter. Mr. Yao agreed that an examiner's amendment correcting these issues according to the examiner's suggestions would expedite prosecution. .